

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In re Applications	)	
	)	
For Low Power Television and Television	)	File No. 20000830BUX, et al. <sup>1</sup>
Translator Stations on Channels 62-69	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

**Adopted: January 13, 2005**

**Released: January 14, 2005**

By the Chief, Video Division, Media Bureau:

1. The Commission, by the Chief of the Video Division of the Media Bureau, has before it the above-captioned applications seeking new analog low power television (LPTV) and TV translator stations on channels 62-69. The applications were opposed by Motorola, Inc.<sup>2</sup> For the reasons set forth below, we deny Motorola's opposition and grant the applications.

2. These applications were filed in August 2000 as part of a window for new analog LPTV and TV translator stations. The applications were later identified as not mutually exclusive and the applicants were instructed to submit their long-form (FCC Form 346) applications.

3. Motorola's sole complaint is that the applicants are proposing to operate on channels 62-69. Motorola claims that grant of these applications will negatively impact the ability of public safety entities to deploy their systems on these channels.

4. In 1998, the Commission reallocated television channels 60-69 for use by new commercial wireless and public safety entities.<sup>3</sup> In the *Report and Order* in the reallocation proceeding, the Commission specifically stated that it would continue to authorize LPTV and TV translator service on channels 60-69 until the end of the DTV transition period, as long as they do not cause harmful interference to primary services.<sup>4</sup>

5. Motorola's opposition is speculative and unsupported. Motorola offers no specific information to suggest that any of the facilities proposed in the applications will cause interference to other Commission licensees. In essence, Motorola's opposition is a late-filed attempt to seek reconsideration of the Commission's earlier determination.

6. Wherefore, the above facts considered, Motorola's opposition IS DENIED.

---

<sup>1</sup> The file numbers of the applications are listed in Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> Application File No. BNPTTL-20000831ALB was also opposed by the State of New York's Office of Technology.

<sup>3</sup> See *Reallocation of Television Channels 60-69*, 12 FCC Rcd 22953 (1998)(*Report and Order*).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 22967.

7. It is further ordered that, having found the applicants qualified, the applications for new analog LPTV and TV translator stations listed in Appendix A ARE GRANTED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Barbara A. Kreisman, Chief  
Video Division  
Media Bureau

## APPENDIX A

<b>File No.</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>CH</b>
20000830BUX	TRINITY CHRISTIAN CENTER	ENTERPRISE	AL	62
20000829AXZ	HOWARD MINTZ	MIDLAND	TX	63
20000831BXJ	VENTURE TECHNOLOGIES GROUP	ROCHELLE	IL	63
20000831BEE	JOHN R. POWLEY	CROCKETT	TX	63
20040115ADD	MS COMMUNICATIONS, LLC	ALEXANDRIA	LA	63
20000829AXZ	HOWARD MINTZ	MIDLAND	TX	63
20040213ACP	UNIVERSITY OF UTAH	TOOELE	UT	63
20000831AUZ	ARDMORE COMMUNITY	ARDMORE	OK	64
20000830AYA	TRINITY CHRISTIAN CENTER	CLINTON	OK	65
20000830AEE	SUMMIT MEDIA, L.P.	PAHRUMP	NV	67
20000831BCZ	JOHN R. POWLEY	GAINESVILLE	TX	67
20000831BCK	JOHN R. POWLEY	LOGAN	UT	67
20000830BQP	AIRWAVES, INC.	OGDEN	UT	68
20000829AWR	MICHAEL MINTZ	BILLINGS	MT	68
20000829AGW	MICHAEL MINTZ	LAWTON	OK	68
20000829AQM	MICHAEL MINTZ	EUREKA	CA	68
20000829AWK	HOWARD MINTZ	PITTSBURG	KS	69
20000829AWQ	MICHAEL MINTZ	BILLINGS	MT	69
20000831ALB	VENTURE TECHNOLOGIES GROUP	PORT JERVIS	NY	69
20000829AWH	HOWARD MINTZ	MIDLAND	TX	69
20000829AWP	MICHAEL MINTZ	OCEAN CITY	MD	69